



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,502	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003037	8691
21967 7590 07/08/2009 HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
EXAMINER				
HUYNH, CONG LAC T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/883,502
Filing Date: June 19, 2001
Appellant(s): BEDELL ET AL.

George Y. Wang
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4/2/09 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/2/09.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

There is a related appeal 09/883,303 awaiting the Board's decision.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

20020069207

ALEXANDER

6-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. (US 2002/0069207 A1, 6/6/02, filed 12/6/00)

Regarding independent claim 6, Alexander discloses a method for creating a report comprising steps:

- selecting a template with one or more template properties ([0006]-[0008], [0040]: generating a report based on a selected survey where a report has format properties such as full, brief, specific question, and statement, and each report when applied the selected format is considered a template for filling data from the survey)
- selecting a filter with one or more filter properties ([0040]: when selecting one of the format properties, the data included in the report is filtered to be included only data required by the selected format)
- specifying one or more of the template or filter properties with a prompt object ([0024], [0040]: each formatted report is selected to comply with the selected survey)
- wherein the prompt object comprises:
 - o a question to be asked of a user (figure 2, [0006]-[0009])
 - o a prompt type ([0034]: survey, which is equivalent to a prompt object, is classified by types such as medical, political, or product preference)
 - o at least one validation property ([0027], [0029]: values assigned to the answers for validating right answers)

- wherein the prompt object is used in creating a report to be executed in a reporting system, wherein the report may specify a prompt object as a property of the report, and wherein the prompt object is an object separate from the report such that the prompt object may be used more than once in a single report or may be used in more than one report ([0008]-[0009], [0029], [0034]: the survey, which is considered the prompt object can be reused more than once in a single report or may be used in more than one report)

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses that at least one validation property comprises verification that the answer provided to the question is of the specified prompt type ([0027, [0029]], [0034]: the values assigned to the answers to the questions are validation properties verifying that the provided answer is of the specified prompt type since for medical survey, there are different questions and answers than for a political survey or product preference survey).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses that the prompt object further comprises a default answer to the question (figure 2).

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses that the prompt object further comprises a meaning that, upon request by a responder to the prompt, provides an explanation of the question (figure 4).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses that the prompt object further comprises a reuse value that indicates whether an answer provided from a previous instance of that prompt object, a default value or a new value is to be used for an answer to the question in the prompt object ([0034]).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses specifying a single prompt object for a plurality of properties in the report and wherein upon report execution, the question receives only one answer that is provided to each property for which the prompt object was specified ([0034]-[0035], figure 3: indicating a specific topic of a survey, which is considered a property of the survey, such as medical practice, family history, or social history would cause the report execution to receive only one answer provided to each type of survey, which is considered equivalent a prompt object).

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses specifying at most one prompt object for a template or filter property ([0040]: specifying at most a survey with a survey ID to generate a report format, which is considered equivalent to a template).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 6, Alexander discloses that the template comprises a set of templates properties and the filter comprises a set of filter properties and wherein every template and filter property may be specified as a prompt

object ([0040]: the report format has a set of format properties, and upon selecting one of the format properties, the report is generated so that data included in the report is limited to the requirement of the report format; in other words, a filter with filter property is implied in generating a report).

Claims 1-5 are for a prompt object as mentioned in claims 6-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 14-20 are for a processor-readable medium of method claims 6-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 21-28 are for a system of method claims 6-13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

(10) Response to Argument

Regarding independent claims 1, 6, 14, and 21, Appellants argue that Alexander fails to show at least the limitation directed to a prompt object comprising a question to be asked of a user, a prompt type and at least one validation property since assigning different types of answers to questions in a survey does not imply that the survey includes a prompt type and a validation property for the data type of the answer and also since Alexander does not even use the terminology "validation", "data type" and "prompt type" in his disclosure.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Alexander discloses a survey including a single question or a set of questions to be asked of a user and answers where answers to all questions in the survey can be selected to generate a report ([0006]-[0007], figure 2). Each survey in Alexander is an object in object-based computer programming with associated properties such as title, subheading, questions, answers and values ([0029]). The survey in Alexander, thus is equivalent to a prompt object as disclosed in the specification (page 16, line 14, "a prompt object includes a question").

Alexander also discloses that surveys are classified by types such as political, medical, or product preference types where *each type has different question and answer pairings* ([0034]). Each survey by itself thus includes its type. Thus, each survey includes both question and survey type. In other words, Alexander discloses a prompt object comprising both question and prompt type.

Alexander further discloses creating and entering the question and answer pairings to a survey ([0008]) where each answer is assigned a value and the values for the answers of a survey are properties of the survey ([0027], [0029]). Since each type of survey has a different set of questions and answers and each answer is assigned a specific value, it is clear that the answer values are the information to ensure that the answers are valid to the questions in each survey of different types. The answer values, which are the properties of the survey ([0029]), are equivalent to the validation values as disclosed in the specification of the application (specification, page 3, lines 5-9, and page 14, and lines 18-21).

Though Alexander does not use the same terminology such as "prompt object", "prompt type" or "validation" as claimed, Alexander does disclose an equivalent prompt object that comprises a question, a prompt type and a validation property via a survey and its properties as shown above.

Applicants also argue that Alexander does not disclose "at least one validation property comprises verification that the answer provided to the questions is of the specified prompt type" as required in claim 2.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Alexander discloses that a catalog is "a set of question and answer pairings", "preferably arranged and classified by type" where each type of survey has specific questions and answers ([0034]). The fact that each answer to a question is *assigned a specific value* as mentioned above and *each question and answer pairing is classified by type* shows that each different value assigned for an answer in each survey of different types is a verification that the answer provided to the question is of a specified survey type. In other words, Alexander discloses "at least one validation property comprises verification that the answer provided to the questions is of the specified prompt type" as argued.

Other arguments regarding the dependent claims have the same responses with the same reason set forth with respect to the independent claims.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Cong-Lac Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
6/29/09

Conferees:

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Stephen Hong

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175